

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the subject application in view of the preceding amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 2, 5-7, and 9-13 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 5, 10 and 11 have been amended herein to more particularly recite what Applicants regard as the invention and Claims 3, 4, 8, 14 and 15 have been cancelled without prejudice. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for indicating in the Office Action that Claims 8 and 11.8 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have amended Claim 1 to include the limitations of Claim 8 and intervening Claims 3 and 4 and have amended Claim 10 to include the limitations of Claim 11.8. These amendments have been made in order to place the current application in condition for allowance and Applicants reserve their right to pursue the originally filed claims in one or more continuation applications.

In the Office Action, Claim 10 was rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,063,594 to Canterbury. As noted above, Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 8 and intervening Claims 3 and 4 and Claim 10 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 11.8. Therefore, Applicants believe that these amendments have rendered moot the rejection made by the Examiner based on Canterbury and an action acknowledging the same is respectfully submitted.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-5, 9-10 and 12 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Canterbury in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,698,586 to Stanley et al. As noted above, Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 8 and intervening Claims 3 and 4 and Claim 10 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 11.8. Therefore, Applicants believe that these amendments have rendered moot the rejection made by

the Examiner to these claims based on Canterbury in combination with Stanley et. al and an action acknowledging the same is respectfully submitted.

In the Office Action, Claims 6-7 and 11.6-11.7 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Canterbury in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,698,586 to Stanley et al., as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,161,309 to O'Donnell. As noted above, Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 8 and intervening Claims 3 and 4 and Claim 10 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 11.8. Therefore, Applicants believe that these amendments have rendered moot the rejection made by the Examiner to these claims based on Canterbury in combination with Stanley et. al and O'Donnell and an action acknowledging the same is respectfully submitted.


It is respectfully submitted that none of the prior art of record, alone or in combination, teaches, discloses or suggests the invention as presently claimed. Based upon the foregoing favorable consideration of Claims 1, 2, 5-7, and 9-13 is respectfully requested. If it is believed that an interview would advance prosecution, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' representative at the number below.

[continued next page]

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees due or which should have been filed herewith (or with any paper hereafter filed in this application by this firm) to our Deposit Account No. 04-1105, under Order No. 65583(71678).

Dated: November 14, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 
David J. Silvia

Registration No.: 49,036

EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE LLP

P.O. Box 55874

Boston, MA 02205

203-353-6839

Attorneys/Agents For Applicants